UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Spiritual Values in American Life - - - - - - - - - *George E. O'Dell*

The Rights of the Individual - *Edmund A. Opitz*

Pied Pipers in Germany - - *Devere Allen*

The New Maginot Line - *Stanton A. Coblentz*

Children and Their Parents' Friends - - - - - - - - - - *Ethel S. Beer*

Fact, Fancy, Truth - - *Herbert Sturges*

The Dynamics of Good Will - *David Jobman*

The Gospel of the Advertiser - *E. P. Herman*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXV NUMBER 5

Chicago, November-December, 1949

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Devere Allen: Editor of *Worldover Press.*

Ethel S. Beer: Author of *Day Nursery.*

Stanton A. Coblentz: Journalist and author.

E. P. Herman: Free lance writer.

David Jobman: Contributor to various anthologies of modern verse.

George E. O'Dell: Formerly, editor of *The Standard,* now residing in England.

Edmund A. Opitz: Minister of the Second Parish in Hingham, South Hingham, Massachusetts.

Herbert Sturges: Formerly, professor in Lombard College, Galesburg, Illinois.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE..... 83

ARTICLES—

Spiritual Values in American Life—GEORGE E. O'DELL..... 84

The Rights of the Individual—EDMUND A. OPITZ..... 87

Pied Pipers in Germany—DEVERE ALLEN..... 89

The New Maginot Line—STANTON A. COBLENTZ..... 90

Children and Their Parents' Friends—ETHEL S. BEER..... 92

Fact, Fancy, Truth—HERBERT STURGES..... 94

The Dynamics of Good Will—DAVID JOBMAN..... 95

The Gospel of the Advertiser—E. P. HERMAN..... 97

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS..... 99

THE FIELD—

World Progress—*Worldover Press*..... 82

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

World Progress

India. In view of the clashes that occurred between Moslems and Hindus at the time of partition, it is worthy of note that during the last year, Moslems have been entering India from Pakistan, for permanent settlement, at the rate of more than 550 every month.

* * *

Norway. Via the national network, Norwegian educators are bringing top English instruction to the schools of the most remote rural regions. More than 4,000 radio pupils have paid the fee of about $2.00 for the winter English series. The students write papers which are corrected, and schoolmen say the results are "revolutionary."

* * *

Germany. Using wood that was already ancient when it was built into the Frauenkirche Cathedral of Mittenwald, Bavaria, in the 15th century, violin makers are turning out instruments which certain experts believe will rival those created by Stradivarius and other masters. The Cathedral was seriously damaged in the war.

* * *

United States. So many Negroes are being appointed to college faculties for the first time that it is difficult to keep score. Among the institutions to take this step recently are Wellesley College, Brown University, and Harvard Medical School.

* * *

Norway. Another 200 displaced persons from camps in Western Germany are to be admitted into Norway. Fifty of them are blind, and the International Refugee Organization has given money to build a workshop where they can be trained. They will take with them the same number of relatives. The remainder of the 200 refugees will have jobs found for them in normal industries. Norway has already accepted several hundred D.P.'s.

—*Worldover Press.*

UNITY

Volume CXXXV NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1949 No. 5

EDITORIAL

Northern Republicans and Democrats cannot dodge responsibility for racial discrimination in the Nation's Capital. They constitute an overwhelming majority in the Congress. They could with ease enact such legislation, and appoint to the administrative body such persons, as might be necessary to end the world-recognized disgrace that hangs over the world's greatest democracy. The suspicion will not down that a majority of Northern Republicans and Democrats do not want to act in this matter and are hiding behind the skirts of the Southern minority in Congress. For half a century the Republicans were in a position to end discrimination in Washington, but they were content merely to receive Negro votes without giving Negroes their rights. More recently many Democrats have been elected to Congress from the North by virtue of Negro votes, but have not raised a voice in behalf of Negro rights in the Capital City. Northern Republican and Democratic members of Congress attempt to save face and appear liberal by lambasting discrimination in the South where they have little power to effect immediate change, but are silent on conditions in Washington where they have full power to effect a change at once. The members of Congress cannot dodge responsibility in this matter even by giving Home Rule to Washington. Home Rule is desirable, but a Home Rule Act should not leave the issue of discrimination to be determined by the residents of Washington. The entire country is involved in what happens in the Capital City. Discrimination should be specifically prohibited whether Washington is governed by a Federal Commission or under a provision for Home Rule. There is something radically wrong when a man like Ralph Bunche feels that he cannot honorably live in our Nation's Capital. The festivities of the last inauguration set a good example; but example is not enough. There must be legislation and strict enforcement. The issue of discrimination in Washington should be met head-on and at once. The liberals in Congress should see to it that every member of Congress is put on the spot by a recorded vote that would let his constituents know precisely where he stands on the matter. Nor should nation-wide pressure groups and church groups be allowed to dodge the issue. They should be compelled by their avowedly liberal members to go on record. The eyes of the world are on Washington to see whether hypocrisy or democracy shall prevail.

Curtis W. Reese.

Spiritual Values in American Life

GEORGE E. O'DELL

First among American values we must place the American himself. How shall we describe him? What forces of thought and practice have gone to the making of him, for, of course, every born and reared national is a child not only of his parents but also, and perhaps even more, of his nation. Indeed, the newcomer may never enter wholly into the native's mind. Yet at times it may happen that, though after many years he knows he is still "on the outside looking in," he may allow himself to be amused by the occasional failure of those inside to get a clear picture of the national traits. Here, for instance, is an account of the "typical American," as given some fifty years ago, by one of the most celebrated of American university presidents, Nicholas Murray Butler:

> The typical American is he who, whether rich or poor, whether dwelling in the North, South, East, or West, whether scholar, professional man, merchant, manufacturer, farmer, or skilled worker for wages, lives the life of a good citizen and a good neighbor; who believes loyally and with all his heart in his country's institutions, and in the underlying principles on which these institutions are built; who directs both his private and his public life by sound principles; who cherishes high ideals; and who aims to train his children for a useful life and for their country's service.

To this description another well-known college professor, Bliss Perry, adds: "This modest and sensible statement indicates the existence of a national point of view."

Now this may well be part of the picture of a good American, but let us suppose that fifty years ago it had been read, with a mere change from the word American, to an audience of English people, or Canadians, or Australians, or Frenchmen, or Italians, or Hollanders, or Belgians, or a dozen others—certainly including the Germans and the Japanese—would there have been any such group most of whom would not at once recognize it as portraying at least part of their own national character? There is nothing peculiarly American about it. There must surely be characteristics in the American portrait more distinctive.

On one point in the statement let us, in search of a closer view, at once fasten. The American "aims to train his children." No doubt all people do that, but the American and even the newcomer, not yet naturalized and what is called "assimilated," do it in a peculiar way. Never shall I forget how, thirty-six years ago, in my first days in America, which were spent as a settlement guest in one of Chicago's most hideous slums, I saw the children of that dread district start, after Labor Day, for school. Their parents may have been living in painful poverty, but these children were all on their way to school with patched clothes, soap-shined faces, and almost all the little girls in clean white stockings. The thought of those clean white stockings has been to me ever since a sort of symbol of America. For the slums I had been most used to see in the Old World would not have shown that passionate hope for the children. This was American; even though the parents were but recent immigrants, they had caught at once onto one of the meanings of America.

But I will not enlarge on that. Let us, however, not yet leave looking at the immigrant. Recently I read a newspaper statement by an English correspondent writing from New York that "all the people in America are but immigrants." Of course there is a sense in which that can be understood—although, for that matter, even the aborigines, according to anthropologists, must sometime in the dim past have been immigrants. It is likely that the writer in question meant his remark rather slightingly. But he was really stating one of the most potent spiritual influences in American history and character. Technically, legally, only a few in these post-quota days are "immigrants." The vast majority are descendants only of immigrants. But they have an immigrant heritage, and that heritage is a splendid one. I am not referring to the people of unusual gifts who have at one or another time come to America and helped to build the nation. It is rather of the common people I am suggesting we should think with pride—mainly peasants off the soil of the old countries. Let no one be ashamed at the thought that America has been in great measure a creation of peasants. For these immigrants were adventurous people. For the most part they were the ones who, in their poverty, were yet willing to take the plunge, the "hazard of new fortunes." They brought with them a grit, a courage, beyond the average of their class in their respective countries. And that adventurousness is in the American spirit. These younger folk have it in their bones and blood and in their brains.

It may be that America is, as some of its own critics say, a conservative nation. But this is politically. It is not conservative in its attack on problems of production and distribution, nor is the American conservative in his individual slant on life—his own life. His conservatism is a result of the appeal to every man to "make good" after his own fashion. Individualism is essentially conservative and disinclined to risk anything that may chance to lessen a man's free field to achieve his own success in life. Let us think rather of the "value" in American life that is contributed by that continual pouring into the country of personal adventurousness.

Adventurousness and romance go together. The American is romantic. Foreign critics sometimes say that dollar-chasing is the American romance. But think what money means to a people with a peasant background, liberated from peasant slavishness. Money is one of the great liberators of the human body and soul. Money is a spiritual value. Aristocracies live on property. Let the property be mainly land, and a people would remain in perpetual servitude to its owners. But let there be a means of ready exchange, and enough of it, and aristocracy is in sight of extinction. Or it changes its character. For the principle of class heredity cannot stand against the pressure of money. Gold is a social alchemist. It is a great leveller. Because America has more money per capita than any other nation she has the largest spirit of equality. The mighty flux of in-between people is a roaring challenge to heredity to defend its claims to innate superiority. No doubt money is an eternal breeder of new aristocracies, an endless invitation to the nobodies to get into the stream and come up higher. Every man below is potentially in the middle, and this enhances the spirit

of equality. Hence the romance of "dollar-chasing." It is a great game. The American is not sordid, not thrifty for mere thrift's sake, not penny-pinching; he is generous, and inclined, indeed, to lavishness.

But all this is shocking? What spiritual values are here? Has nothing better gone into the making of the American heritage than mere energy, tirelessness, and the craving to go one better than the Joneses?

Let us now, however, take a longer look at the history of American idealism. Let us recall the brief annals of American life. The Puritans brought with them certain doctrines as to the essential vileness of human nature, the vanity of our present life, and the impossibility of salvation hereafter except by vicarious atonement and grace. These doctrines were liable neither to proof nor disproof by experience in the comfortable rural life from which, for the most part, the forefathers of America came. But the religious émigrés and their children and grandchildren found themselves up against unaccustomed elemental things of life. They had to face the icy blasts of Massachusetts, to fight the aborigines, to uproot the wilderness, to push after the setting sun. At hard grips with nature, over a long course of years, they gained three first-hand revelations which by no means accorded with the harsh doctrines of the early settlers. Man, with his capacity for strenuous labor, his loyalty to comrades, his devotion to loved ones, his pluck, endurance and skill, was no longer easily to be thought of as vile. Life, the passionate life of conquest and settlement, had too great a zest to be mere vanity; it was worthwhile. And spiritual betterment surely depended as much upon an inner development of character as on means of grace.

When the time was ripe, the new faith in man made possible the Revolution. The Declaration of Independence is an embodiment of it. And it took literary form further in the wonderful flowering of post-Puritan literature. For post-Puritan it was! The great New Englanders who first gave America a poetry and philosophy were Puritans—with a difference. Their spirits were bathed in the atmosphere of American experience; the conquest of the wilderness spoke through them.

They had a passionate belief in life. Certainly if other-worldliness gave way in their writings to a new worldliness, it was of no sybaritic order. It was strenuous, almost austere. Yet nothing about it was more remarkable than its insistence on the immediate worth of life. It is sometimes said of America that it is the land of the future. And the phrase doubtless has a great meaning. But it must be sharply qualified in the face of what some Americans have said. Longfellow, it is true, was not a poet's poet. But no verse in our language has so echoed around the world, so electrified thousands of English-speaking youth, as this:

> Trust no future, howe'er pleasant,
> Let the dead past bury its dead;
> Act, act in the living present,
> Heart within and God o'erhead.

That is to say, be sure of your own immediate worth, and that the eternal order of things is somehow on your side.

America had spent its forty days and nights in the wilderness, struggling with body as well as with soul, and when it had well emerged, such men as these spoke its new mood. Emerson spoke it. Emerson has been adjudged a cold intellectualist—by those who have not understood his mystical experience, which tempered him to flashing steel. "Trust thyself!" he cried. America and Europe presently rang with it. To such of the old Puritanism as remained, it may have seemed blasphemy. Trust God, rather! But to Emerson it was no other thing. It was Deity lost in the skies, and rediscovered in the heart of man. He said "whim" but he did not mean whim; he meant that man true to himself was true to the eternal order of things. And he expressed the immigrant vigor and adventurousness that had gone to the making of America, and goes to the making of it, in its best minds, still. Let us repeat that most thrilling passage in the *Essay on Self-Reliance:* "And we are now men . . . and not minors or invalids in a protected corner, not cowards fleeing before a revolution, but guides, redeemers, and benefactors, obeying the Almighty Effort and advancing on Chaos and the Dark." What the peasant had done in taming the wilderness, and a multitude of minds and hands had done towards building a new and freer civilization in this broad land, Emerson saw lifted up into the realm of ideas and ideals; the same adventurousness was to help build a better philosophy, a better ethics, a better religion, advancing on the vast mysteries of thought, and making human order out of seeming Chaos and the Dark. Difficult ventures indeed, and needing long centuries ahead perhaps to complete them. But such men as William Ellery Channing, Theodore Parker, Josiah Royce, William James, Felix Adler, and John Dewey—Americans all, and each with an intensely personal yet democratic vision, and unafraid of the fierce clash of competing ideas—have followed Emerson in their free and bold attacks on the deep fundamental problems of life. The American pioneer spirit is in them all.

If the great spiritual values in America, of a sort we remind ourselves of today, are Freedom, Adventurousness, and the idea of Human Equality, it is the last-named which has been the cause of the most mind-searching, not to say heart-searching, on the part of Americans anxious to justify their national particularity in their own eyes. Jefferson thrust the challenging word Equality into the Declaration, but what did it, what does it, mean? No doubt, it was a sounding slap on the cheek of King George III. But surely it was more. No one "on the outside looking in," in a sympathetic spirit, can escape recognizing that the idea of equality has made a profound difference to American life and manners. The immigrant not only senses it in advance, but he quickly absorbs it into his own spirit, even so as sometimes to be harshened by it in his attitude towards others, as against the old subservience, even servility, from which he has wanted to escape. On the other hand, there are many Americans who so little feel the difference which the idea of equality makes in their nation that they speak of it slightingly, or deny it to mean anything but, perhaps, equality before the law (which is not peculiarly American) or what they call equality of opportunity, which, as a matter of fact is mainly negative, a mere lessening of barriers to individual advance. The same education for all, for instance; but where is the equality if my school neighbor is clever and I am a fool? If equality is to have any reality it must surely be in something within! But what?

It is, of course, possible to be romantic about the idea of equality. Walt Whitman, who, even more than the New Englanders, expressed the American spirit, romanticized the idea. "By God," he says, "I will

accept nothing which all cannot have on the same terms." But that is merely external, as I have just tried to indicate; the terms are the same only if I equally with anyone else am capable of taking advantage of them. But listen again,—this time to more ecstatic lines:

Painters have painted their swarming groups and the center figure of all,
From the head of the center figure spreading a nimbus of gold-colored light.
But I paint myriads of heads but paint no head without its nimbus of gold-colored light.
From my hand, from the brain of every man and woman it streams effulgently forever.
Whoever you are, now I place my hand upon you that you be my poem.
I will leave all, and come and make the hymns of you.
I sing the songs of the glory of none, not God, sooner that I sing the songs of the glory of you.

Yes, that is romantic. Whitman was no mere dreamer; he was a shrewd judge of men. Yet he saw the halo, as perhaps you and I do not see it. Yet I make bold to say, still as an outsider looking in, that Whitman here expresses something which—though he may not himself clearly know what it is or how to justify it—goes to the making of the American spirit, and that is a sense of moral potentiality in every man, which makes him human and justifies us in having towards him the respect of expectancy.

We cannot postulate equality in any sense on the planes of physical strength or intelligence or beauty. But on the moral plane we make demands—that people shall act as good neighbors, as the right kind of husbands, wives, parents, friends, workers, that they shall give clean votes in elections, that they shall support their country in whatever way we ask of them in a day of trial. For morality is just that, and such morality is at once a great part of the building blocks and almost all of the cement that make a free civilization possible. Certainly the code of right conduct grows as civilization advances and our relations with one another become more complex, or as we see the problems of life more clearly. But morality is not primarily a matter of intelligence or of subtle intuitions, it is a matter rather of the bent of the will. Moral genius is genius only in so far as the moral will—the desire and purpose to do right as one sees the right—is enhanced by mental capacity, sympathy, experience of men and affairs; but these are not the good will itself. And Immanual Kant was right when he said that there is nothing higher than the good will. The man who has refused a bribe, curbed a passion, told the truth at a cost, preferring the right rather than his own private profit or satisfaction, has achieved, at least for that moment, the highest. In the same circumstances God Almighty could do no more highly than he.

The moral life, in its essential disinterestedness, is one. The street-sweeper and the archbishop, in so far as they attain disinterested devotion to duty, are one. The door to such fineness is open to all. Furthermore, to the end of a man's life, no one dare say of him that not by any concatenation of circumstances can he be brought to will the good rather than evil. All religion, except where it has fallen into the pit of predestination, is but one or another way of asserting this very thing—or there is no just excuse for its propaganda. It is only too true that a man cannot save himself; the responsibility of salvation is upon us all. Though with all our education, our exhortation, our pleading, our social betterment, and our personal helpfulness, we should not have brought the liar to the point where he will tell the truth and "shame the devil," nor persuaded the thief to cease to steal, nor caused the heartless exploiter of other men's labor to turn to better ways, it is not that he is proved incapable of the will to righteousness; merely we have not discovered the avenue to reach his potentiality of spiritual response. The possibility of awakening him is somehow there; perhaps we have failed because we have doubted. We did not see the nimbus. Nor have we perhaps seen that the guilt of any one is in a measure the guilt of all; that if we demand not intelligence or strength or beauty, but do demand right feelings and behavior, it is up to us through ever-increasing betterment of education and social and economic relationships not merely to reduce the temptations to wrongdoing but positively to enhance the worthwhileness of right living for all.

This is what the equalitarian spirit should work towards, persistently and without wearying. It is not a matter just of "the same terms." We differ vastly from one another, in our heredity, our home influences, our natural or acquired tastes, our abilities. In a sense, the terms need to be different, that is to say adjusted, in the case of every individual; and this calls for a measure of solicitude in persons and communities far beyond the live-and-let-live equality of opportunity and life which the pioneer days have bequeathed us. We need to move towards a social integration earlier unthought of explicitly, but implicit in the American ideal of a worthwhile existence for all.

There is a quaint statement in a book about civilization by the late Prof. Cecil Delisle Burns. "In England," he said, "we have a way of saying, 'Ah, we have Shakespeare, but what have the Americans?—bathtubs.'" Yes, comments Dr. Burns, but in England how many people know their Shakespeare; while in America a great mass of people have bathtubs. That is civilization, he tells us, not the culture of the few but the decent living of the many. The wider spread the bathtubs, the wider the civilization.

Therein, surely, is a symbol. It is a spiritual value in American life that there shall be bathtubs for as many people as possible. But if bathtubs, then also increasingly the best schools, the best libraries, the best workshops, the best rural communities, the best and most uplifting conditions for all, and the training from childhood in sharing rightly in them. And all based on the notion, not only that it is right and expedient that civilized living shall be widespread, but also the belief that a fine human life, a fine citizenship, a fine neighborliness, is possible on a scale far beyond anything humanity has yet achieved.

America is still a pioneer nation. She has a message for the world, born out of hard-earned experience. It is that democracy is something more, even much more, than pulling a lever in a polling booth. It means the appeal to think in social terms, to belong consciously in a community, to share intelligence with others, to do one's work in the world so as to enhance the working power and achievement of others, to recognize that class barriers and monstrous economic distinctions are an insult to the human soul, that in all men there is the possibility of decency, however it may have been warped or deadened, and that the greatest of adventures is to seek it out and establish it. Let America *prove* the worth of democracy and thus teach the world.

Do you remember those two extraordinary stories in the New Testament, one of which deals with inequality

and the other with equality? In the first, the employer leaves with his servants various responsibilities, and rewards them on his return from a journey according to the way they have used them. Those who have done well he makes "rulers over many cities." And naive Christians have been used too often to think of the reward in terms of purple and fine linen, of Solomon and all his glory, and to forget the anxious days and sleepless nights of conscientious rulers. These servants were given greater or lesser powers, as we are born with greater or lesser gifts; they were unequal in capacities, but the greater the capacities the greater the demand that they should live worthy of them. And the payment for being faithful to responsibility was more responsibility.

In the other story the employer hires men at earlier or later hours in the day, but in the end pays them all alike. Indeed, when almost threatened with a strike, he rubs in his moral by telling his steward to pay the last first. All these men had stood in the market place waiting to be hired. All had shown willingness to work. Here was equality of will.

Certainly Jesus was not preaching economic socialism. Most probably the story had to do with conditions for entry into the coming more righteous world. But the moral implication is clear. It is that of the democracy of the rightly bent will. It is that of equality on the highest plane, which is possible to all.

The economic reformer, the socialist, may now intervene and say that only what is good enough for the Kingdom of Heaven is in the end good enough for us here on earth. This is my own view. But as regards a man's subsistence, this is only a deduction from a wide principle, and not even the first in order at that. The principle is that the essential quality of humanity is the moral will. And the first deduction is that we must assume the possibility of eliciting it in every man. We may have to get after some, if they happen to be morally opaque, with blood and fire—and then fail to reach their hidden depths. But we must not therefore enslave any, nor must we despoil any, nor give ourselves birth-proud or purse-proud airs against any. Or some day we may happen to see the nimbus of gold-colored light and be plunged into scarlet shame.

The Rights of the Individual

EDMUND A. OPITZ

It was perceived by some men of the ancient world that the distribution of men as slave and free, Greek and barbarian, Roman and others, was not inherent in the design of nature. "He is sometimes a slave who should be master," said Cicero, "and sometimes master who should be slave." These are accidents of circumstance, but man is a creature of a more fundamental law. Said Cicero again:

> Of all these things about which learned men dispute there is none more important than clearly to understand that we are born for justice, and that right is founded not in opinion but in nature. There is indeed a true law, right reason, agreeing with nature and diffused among all, unchanging, everlasting, which calls to duty by commanding, deters from wrong by forbidding.

These several strands were picked up by the Church and woven into the fabric of its doctrine. Their compatibility with Jesus' thought is apparent. One of the central ideas of Jesus was that persons were of supreme worth. To convey his idea that individuals were organic to a Reality that transcended their differences he used the symbol of sonship. "One is your Father," he said, "and all ye are brethren." Obviously Jesus believed this idea to be a fact of man's nature despite its apparent denial in the actual arrangements of human society. The implication conveyed by the symbols "sons of God" and "brethren," as it applies to men's relation to each other, is that the bond of union between them shall be a free fellowship. The situation which had long obtained in the Greco-Roman world opposed a formidable reality to this ideal. That reality was slavery.

The classical world reposed upon slavery; between one-half and two-thirds of its people were slaves. The less pleasant work of the world was done under direct compulsion of pain and death for the slave who did not accomplish his task. The master-slave relationship was diametrically opposed to the Christian teaching of what should compose the bond between men, yet there was apparently no violent collision between the two concepts. There was, however, a slow eroding of the old bonds under the new solvent of freedom. It must have become more and more evident to the Christian who held slaves that there was a wide incompatibility between the legal right to appropriate the labor power of another, and the fact, if his religion were true, that this other was equally with himself a son of the Heavenly Father. Between individuals who are children of God there is only one possible relationship, a relationship of perfect freedom. This idea gained ground, even if it did not take over completely, and Medieval Europe, whatever its other defects, did not condemn the bulk of men to slavery as did the Greco-Roman world.

The forms of expression which satisfy some eras are felt to be inadequate by men of other periods. The Age of Enlightenment did not find the theological overtones of such a phrase as "sons of God" congenial, so it translated the idea implicit in that phrase into naturalistic terms. The Doctrine of Natural Rights was the center of controversial attention and interest in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It found its most familiar expression in the fine phrases of the Declaration of Independence. "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. . ." If this means anything at all, it means that each individual has within himself something sacred and inviolable, a core of natural rights upon which no other individual, group, or even the State can encroach without a violation of the person. These

rights are inherent in the individual by virtue of his humanity; they are not provisionally lent him by the State or by society, but are his in virtue of the general nature and plan of the universe and of the part which he has to play in that scheme. The individual's right to life and liberty is limited only by the equal rights of others; no one has any inherent claim to prerogatives as against any other.

The individual's right to life and liberty may be overridden or denied; he may be exploited, enslaved, or killed. But his rights have not been annulled when they have been confronted by denial or thwarted by superior might; they still exist and they accuse the violator. Even if the exploitation is done legally, that is, with the sanction of the State, it is not thereby made right, for a higher law is transgressed. The individual is not granted his rights by the State, and the State cannot take them away even though it may deny them. To be law-abiding is not necessarily the same thing as to be God-fearing.

The doctrine of natural rights is not widely held today. Even among churchmen where the idea of the infinite worth of every person is, one would think, a rather important part of their creed, there is little resistance to the prevailing notion that an individual's rights may be disregarded if they come into conflict with the decrees of the State. A new absolute has been set up in our day, the State; and the individual has been reduced from a son of God to a fragment of the State which occasionally exhibits the absurdity of a fragment trying to press its claims against those of the whole. Under the new dispensation the citizens are ciphers to be moved about and made to do this or that as suits the planner at the top, and when the ciphers are all lined up a significant figure from the elite is placed at the head of each row and the ciphers become a quantity. No better word was spoken at Amsterdam than when Emil Brunner called Statism "the real social devil of our time," and referred to "our crazy faith in the State." Everyone is in favor of freedom in the abstract, and most of us would oppose totalitarianism —except in principle.

An early version of the Declaration spoke of man's right to life, liberty, and property, but the word "property" was dropped, perhaps because it seemed obvious that without a right to property the rights to life and liberty are meaningless. A man dies unless he can expend his labor upon the natural resources and opportunities provided by Nature, fashioning them to minister to his needs—or unless he is employed at some later stage as the product passes on toward the consumer. But the first right is basic, the right of access to natural resources, to the earth. Rightful property is but an extension of the self; it is labor power impressed upon material, and after work the product belongs to him who exerted the labor. The right to life implies an equivalent right to produce the means of life: food, clothing, shelter, and the things which satisfy man's higher needs. This is to say that a man's right to life implies a right to property; "me" implies "mine." If there is nothing valid in the idea of "belonging," if there is no such thing as rightful property in the claim of a person to the objects created by his labor, then there is no such thing as an inalienable right to life. Without a right to property in the means of existence, the individual is the creature of him who controls those means. He lives on somebody else's terms or he dies, which is to say that he is a slave. The right of an individual to enjoy the results of his labor, i.e. his property, is but to phrase his right to life in more specific terms. Whoever deprives a man of his rightful property places that man's very life in jeopardy, or puts it at the disposal of some other man or agency. This is, of course, a direct denial of the doctrine of natural rights; and, if anything, an even more vehement denial that man is a son of God.

The denial of the right to property, and consequently of the right to life, comes today chiefly from the State —no matter what its political complexion. Under socialism (meaning Socialism, Communism, Fascism, or any variety of Statism—including our own!) the State lays prior claim to all production. Karl Marx, in *The German Ideology,* wrote: "From each according to his ability; to each according to his need." Article 12 of the 1936 Soviet Constitution reads: "In the U.S.S.R. the principle of socialism is realized: 'From each according to his ability; to each according to his work.'" The State exercises its power to take everything a man produces and agrees to dole back to him what it thinks he needs or what it thinks his work is worth. Thus the individual is in thrall to the State; whether he goes on living and how he lives will be decided by the State. If the individual shows signs of individualism the State can decide that he needs nothing or that he will be happier in a slave labor camp. In denying that the fruits of his labor belong to the individual who worked, socialism denies the right to property and likewise the right to life itself. It is driven to assert that such rights as exist are provisionally granted by the State and may be withdrawn at the pleasure of the State.

The power to tax, it has been observed, is the power to destroy. A tax is a fine or a penalty, it always comes out of production and undermines the concept of property. The individual is not secure in the products of his labor if the State exercises its power to appropriate a percentage of those products. Experience seems to show that the percentage exacted by the State always increases, never diminishes. As an ever larger share of labor products are syphoned off by the State as taxes, the laborer becomes increasingly reluctant to produce, for the enjoyment of his product is the only incentive the worker has to expend his energy. A man lives at capacity when he is free to enjoy what he has produced, or to exchange his products for those of his fellows. If a portion of his property is confiscated his life is by that much diminished—up to extinction if all his property is taken. When a man has produced something it is rightfully his—provided that he has a right to life and liberty at all. The only way it can become the property of another without violating a principle is on a free exchange basis. Trade is the only ethical basis for the exchange of property—the rendering of goods and/or services for goods and/or services. Taxation does not qualify, for it is not payment for services rendered (except for a small portion of taxation); it is levied on the basis of ability to pay, need to buy, ability to produce, impotence to resist, and unwillingness to complain.

The tax fund creates a pool from which a steady succession of groups are subsidized, that is to say, given more than their goods and services would otherwise obtain. They are subsidized by tariffs, patents, parity prices, exemptions, and laws favoring this group against that. Everyone cannot take more out of a common pool than he has put in, so it is a mathematical impossibility that all groups and all individuals be subsidized. Some are enabled by pressure on

politicians to get something for nothing, but by the same token, the unorganized are getting nothing for something. The scheme is designed to work that way and it is immoral. It enables those with political power to live off those who do not have it.

Where the State is not directly trenching upon property and infringing a natural right, it is the power which supports and legalizes other infringements, notably in the fields of land and rent, and money and credit.

No man labored to produce the earth, it is the free gift of nature. By his exertions upon it man produces the things needful to life. That which gives him a clear title to call a thing his own is the fact that he has labored to produce it. But if someone has gotten first to natural resources and sites, he is in a position to exact tribute from those who have nowhere to exert their labor power but upon the now preëmpted sites, or others similarly held. Possession of a desirable part of the earth is the power of exacting tribute from those who must work it. Without the products of the earth we perish; there is no other way of obtaining them except by working for them or by being in a position to take the fruits of some other person's toil. If the products of the earth belong in equity to those who produce them, the earth itself cannot ethically belong to anybody, for ownership of the earth confers the privilege of taking from the producer. Thus property in land and property in labor products are antithetical; if one concept is valid the other is not. If the individual is to be secure in the clear title to his rightful property—which is a corollary of his right to life—he must not be forced to turn over part of what he produces for the privilege of producing anything at all.

Every society has felt the need of some services that cannot be taken care of by the sporadic activities of individuals: for an agency to maintain individual rights and to punish any trespass on those rights, to provide fire and police protection, and so on. To pay for these services, in lieu of taxes which cannot be levied without trenching on property, the community could take what belongs to it of right, namely, ground rent, the monetary expression of the social value of land. This is a fund which was zero when the need for social services did not exist, i.e. when the first settler put down his stakes in a given area, but which now amounts to hundreds of millions annually in a place like Manhattan where the need for social services is great. Once the distinction between wages and rent is grasped, it will be perceived that the community can appropriate rent without infringing on the right of property. Suffice it to say here that what a man's individual efforts have produced are his wages which are his property, but the augmentation which his individual efforts receive from society is that part of the total production due to rent.

Money is needed to facilitate the exchange of goods; its function is to move goods from producer to consumer, and it would seem obvious that it should be adequate in volume to move all goods produced. But about 90 per cent of our circulating medium is bank credit; it is based on willingness to go into debt rather than on ability to produce. On this indebtedness some one has to pay interest, a cost which is paid by producers. This is another example of a group entrenched by legal privilege which enables it to obtain goods and services without rendering commensurate service in return.

The omission of any mention of the money question from the reports on Amsterdam is more than interesting in view of the attention that churchmen for centuries gave to the subject of usury. It is quite conventional for men from endowed churches and schools to criticize what we absurdly call "capitalism," but usury is a tabooed subject.

The individual's defenses have been beaten down, his basic rights have been ignored, but this has not disposed of them. The individual still has a right to life and liberty and all that this implies. If man is in fact a son of God, or if he has inherent natural rights due to his place in the universe, this fact will again become apparent when the evil consequences of ignoring it have worked themselves out to the bitter end. The individual of the modern world is being submerged. The areas where voluntary control operate are contracting; coercion is replacing cooperation. The conflict which looms is between a reluctant totalitarianism and a totalitarianism on the make. But there is a third force whose ingredients are freedom and the individual, and the nature of things is on its side.

Pied Pipers in Germany

DEVERE ALLEN

The town of Hamelin, famous for the legend of its Pied Piper, lies in a part of Germany that suffered little destruction during the war. Only a few buildings were damaged, either in the center or the outlying villages that grace the lovely Weser Valley. In one quaint old rathskeller the British occupation forces have set up a snack bar, and around the walls in medieval lettering runs the story, as told in Browning's poem, of the boys and girls who could not resist the lure and were led out to oblivion.

Two Pied Pipers, as the Germans see it, are now vying for their support and are making a special appeal to youth. So far as most of the German people can figure, the result is likely to be the same as in the ancient tale. With an East German State under Communist guidance pulling in one direction, and a West German State under the Allies asking for allegiance, the Germans are nothing but a prize in a race between outside rivals. Never in their history given a long period in which to develop political maturity, the Germans on the whole will perform a miracle if they show much power to reconstruct their lives in such an impossible position.

On the face of it the struggle looks promising for the West. If Western Germany can be taken into partnership in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, this will be a great inducement. The West can argue, too, that its Bonn government, however weak, was set up after state governments were established through secret ballot, in turn creating

a constitution and a democratically elected federal assembly. The first election proved to be a setback for Communism. So attractive has the West appeared, despite its handicaps, that many thousands of Germans have trekked into it from the Soviet-dominated regions of the East.

It would be foolish, all the same, to assume that the East German State is altogether lacking in attraction. It will exert a challenge to the Western Allies. It is not so crowded. No fewer than 47,257,000 people are packed into West Germany's 94,739 square miles, as compared to 18,320,000 in East Germany's 41,390. Though the West has a greater industrial power, it is woefully lacking in farm acreage. A balanced economic life will be easier to achieve in the East.

East Germany does not want for capable leaders, given the framework in which they operate. They do not have to answer to popular opinion as do those of the West, for they are under the orders of the Moscow Politburo. Both parts of Germany are well-policed, but the police in the East are more arbitrary, and carry rifles and tommy-guns. While the ruling party, the misnamed Socialist Unity Party, or S.E.D., is to be given its head, the reins will be in the hands of Russia.

A great show is being put on by the Russians to convince the Germans that in the East they are on their own. If anything was needed to explode this notion, it is the action taken by the S.E.D. to condemn Tito as a traitor who must be opposed as bitterly by Germans as by good Communists in the Soviet sphere. East German leaders have to go to indoctrination schools, such as the *Parteihochschule Karl Marx* in Brandenburg, headed by a Communist editor, Rudolf Lindau.

Students are taught every last detail of Marxist-Leninist theory, and a recent survey showed that at least 8,000 of them are enrolled in the various institutions aiming to produce good Communists. The new Chancellor of East Germany, Otto Grotewohl, is a renegade Socialist. His anti-Hitler record, at least, must inspire respect. Originally a printer, he became an editor and a member of the Reichstag. For his anti-Nazi activities he was thrown into the notorious Dachau concentration camp, where he endured imprisonment for twelve years. Three years ago he went over to the Communists, and for his reward was made co-chairman of the S.E.D.

On three counts the East German State can exert a strong appeal to some Germans in the West. Russia will make a peace treaty with her puppet regime, while the Western Allies still contend that neither they nor the Bonn government can soon be ready for any such dispensation. On foreign policy the East German government will theoretically be permitted to do what it deems best, while the West German government has been denied the right to control its foreign policy and the Western Allies are unlikely to relax the ban. Dismantling goes on in the West more than four years after the surrender, and the Germans grow increasingly angry. Their workers are thrown out of jobs, the German comeback is delayed, and in order to let the French continue this program, which is backed by the British for dubious reasons, American taxpayers must cough up more money to keep the Germans from disaster.

The main thing is this: Neither in West Germany nor in East Germany is there the kind of government which would be chosen if the nation were united and allowed to vote as a whole. In such a vote, it is hard to believe that the majority would be Christian Democratic, and it would certainly not be Communist. The Social Democrats, most dependable foes of any future totalitarianism, would almost surely lead, and the government would be a coalition excluding the Communists. In the present situation the Western Allies can be gratified only because they have kept Communism out of their bailiwick, but they can hardly be happy over the condition of the German people, for whom the immediate future holds little but frustration.

The one hope lies now in non-governmental channels. Through work for welfare, education, religion, business, science, on unofficial levels, companionship can be maintained with a sort of democratic elite among German groups and individuals. Democracy can be presented as a living thing, a common aspiration. The more futile the political approach, the more indispensable becomes the international cooperation of constructive minds.

The New Maginot Line

STANTON A. COBLENTZ

Ever since the melancholy events of the Second World War, when a defensive psychology caused France and much of the Western World to deny reality by hiding its head in the sands, we have considered the phrase "Maginot Line" synonymous with blind futility. Nevertheless, few of us recognize that we are in the process of erecting a new and still more misleading Maginot Line. By this I do not refer to any particular weapon, not even the atomic bomb, even though this does tend to make us Maginot-minded; I refer to the sinister, devastating outlook that leads us to suppose that there is any defense at all against modern warfare. It is this outlook that rules us in our piling up of armaments, our North Atlantic Security pacts; and it is this outlook that seems likely to betray us as tragically as France was betrayed by her elaborate, useless series of fortifications.

Let me hasten to explain that, in making this statement, I am not denying the possible advantages of defensive weapons, and of North Atlantic Security pacts; nor am I alleging that it is necessary to be caught without a shield in the event of threatened attack. But I am suggesting that we are being duped and blinded and may ultimately be destroyed by the psychology which accompanies our preparations—the psychology which assumes that these preparations may be sufficient in themselves, rather than a mere makeshift, a stopgap of only temporary and limited utility. Our defensive measures, in other words, tend to stifle the clear, decisive voice proclaiming that modern war itself, not our prospective adversary in a war, is the real enemy to be combatted; that modern war, whether we win or lose, is a peril before which all other perils dwindle into insignificance; that modern warfare per-

mits no victories other than pyrrhic ones, and inundates the conqueror and the conquered alike amid the ashes and debris of a splintered world.

We in the United States, no less than the peoples of Europe, have reason to realize these facts. We in the United States, victimized by one of the most startling ironies in history, and obliged to pour out wealth by the fleet-load in order to repair the wounds we ourselves deliberately caused, should have more than an inkling of the cost of modern war even to the winner. And yet the price to us has been slight beside that exacted of many nations, which, with battered cities, broken social systems, and anemically depleted human and natural resources, have been hazardously close to the border line of the chaos from which there is no return.

And yet the last war, it is generally conceded, may be to the next only what a dress rehearsal is to the actual play. It is needless, for our present purposes, to go into the predictions of possible horrors, including bacterial warfare, atomic and chemical sprays of unprecedented potency, guided trans-oceanic missiles, new and bigger atom bombs, etc.; it should suffice the most grisly-minded observer merely to read the daily papers and contemplate the actualities even in so far as they have been made public: bombing planes that can strike at any continent, bombing planes that can circumnavigate the earth non-stop, rocket projectiles that can travel ninety miles or more into the stratosphere, rocket ranges of three thousand miles openly mentioned as desirable or necessary, and atomic work in more lands than one being speeded and presumably improved in secret laboratories.

Even were a new World War to give us merely the weapons of the last—and this would be a little as if motor-age farmers were to confine themselves to ox-teams—the burden would be more than our harassed race could bear. Great nations, even now gasping for breath as they struggle against the disintegration of the last war, would be compelled to give up the unequal contest; starvation, pestilence, and anarchy would be the lords, and violence the law; social structures would crumble, and each survivor would have to fend for himself amid a savagery such as no jungle tribe ever knew. Even among the relatively fortunate peoples—the term "relative" being applied as it would be to a doomed prisoner who is granted a reprieve—impoverishment would be the general lot, and social cohesion would be possible only under a dictatorial dominance, which might repress freedom of thought and action, stifle all those outgrowths of the mind and spirit generally known as "culture," and regiment the land's remaining resources and people with a military severity. Where then, O War, would be your victories?

This brief summary of future probabilities is not exaggerated or alarmist; it is based upon a sober realization of what actually has happened following the last two great wars; and it does not even take into account the still more portentous prospect that the use of nuclear weapons may annihilate the human race, sterilize it, produce a breed of monsters, or, at the least, render vast sections of the planet uninhabitable for decades or centuries. Yet none of these possibilities should be disregarded.

All of which brings us back to our Maginot psychology. In our preoccupation with methods of defense, both military and political, we have forgotten that there is only one weapon against the next war: not to let it happen. We sometimes hear it said that there are worse things than war; and this may be true from the point of view of some individuals or groups of individuals; but from the point of view of man as a whole there is and can be nothing worse than war, since war embraces and magnifies within itself all evils: persecution and massacre, enslavement of the body and spirit, profligate waste of resources both human and material, human torment and wretchedness on an unparalleled scale, moral degeneration and the inflaming of all base passions, the destruction of the rootsource of civilization, and the planting of seeds for the perpetuation of the very diseases conflict is supposed to cure. In view of all this—and the facts are too well-known to require reiteration—how unrealistic, how tragic to devote our main efforts to fighting the next war rather than to fighting against its occurrence!

The reader will, of course, point to the enormous difficulties involved in forestalling future war; will cite the feebleness of the efforts made by the United Nations; will call attention to the uncooperative attitude of Russia, her tremendous armaments program, her supposed doctrine of world conquest, and the seeming impossibility of reaching any binding agreement with such an antagonist. And it must, indeed, be admitted that the obstacles are profound. Nevertheless, to let ourselves be daunted by obstacles, when the very life of mankind or of civilization is at stake, would be to prove ourselves lacking in that life-impulse without which we would not deserve to live. Even if the barriers are actually insurmountable—and there seems ample reason to doubt this—my contention is that we have not taken the trouble to find out; that we have been so absorbed in our supposed defenses that we have given hardly a glance to the only defense which in the long run will avail us at all. Have we ever, for example, seriously thought of abandoning the idea of national sovereignty—that idea in pursuance of which each nation acts as its own policeman, and becomes, almost as a matter of course, involved in individual affrays? Have we ever studiously and honestly tried to create a world armed force which would render the national armed units impotent except for internal affairs? Have we attempted to establish an international tribunal whose word would be respected and binding? Have we given any profound thought to building up an international union that would be not merely military but also political and economic? Have we, in our fatalism and defeatism, paused to realize that no one nation or bloc of nations, however recalcitrant or aggressive, would have the power or would dare to oppose itself to an organized unit of all the other nations of the earth?

These questions are not startling; and their answers are self-evident to all who seriously ask them. Why, then, do so few ask them? Because our Maginot psychology, as already suggested, has made us concentrate upon winning rather than preventing the next war. Once we come to realize that no one will win the next war—that even to expect to win is like looking forward to winning a bout of pneumonia rather than to avoiding the disease—we may give more of our attention to the only true method of defense. And in that possibility, and that possibility alone, lies the hope that our children and our children's children will enjoy a civilized and humane existence.

Children and Their Parents' Friends

ETHEL S. BEER

For some unearthly reason, parents have a notion that children must like everybody. Otherwise, they seem to feel that they will become complete misfits in society. But why should children like each stray visitor that comes to their home? Why should they be drawn to the friends of their parents? Grownups have their preferences. In fact, the adult who is invariably sweet to all is an object of suspicion.

"How can he be sincere?" is the question asked.

Rarely, though, is the same attitude applied to children. Yet they, too, may have their likes and dislikes. Why not let them choose their associates? There is no reason why people should be forced ruthlessly on children, just because they are accepted by the elders in the family. To say that children are too young to judge is not fair either. Granted that they have made a mistake, is this not essential in the process of learning? Besides, the emotional reaction must be taken into account. Children should not have to endure the company of those they detest, whether or not there is reason for this feeling.

Often the parents are at fault in the handling of the situation. They may forget the rules of courtesy. For instance, it is not infrequent for the parent to omit introducing the child to the adult.

"These are my children." Mother will say, ignoring entirely that they, too, are confronted by strangers.

Youngsters themselves are much more formal. I remember on one occasion a three-year-old presenting me to his two-year-old sister as follows:

"This is Polly," he said, "Polly, this is Ethel."

Furthermore, when visitors appear they are too often permitted to interfere with the child's routine. Now what child wants to have its play interrupted to greet an unknown and uninteresting somebody? While as for upsetting a meal or a nap so that the guest will not miss seeing Billy, this is inexcusable. Is it any wonder that sleepy Billy cries out:

"I don't like you!"

And when Mother says that he does not mean it, that only teaches him hypocrisy. He means it and she knows it.

Nor is it remarkable if Betty weeps when she knows that Aunty is coming. For then Mother and Aunty will have their own tête-à-tête minus Betty. Since Betty is usually her mother's chief concern, she naturally resents being shoved into the background. The withdrawal of a certain amount of her mother's attention from Betty, an only child, may be beneficial. But such erratic treatment which makes her feel that she is the center of the universe at one moment and an outsider the next, cannot be unravelled by Betty's budding mental capacity. Quite naturally she blames it all on Aunty.

The child who is neglected completely in favor of each odd lot of company is sure to become fussy or a show-off. In some way it is going to recapture its lost position. Just watch it! Ordinarily Benny eats his lunch peacefully. He feeds himself skilfully for a four-year-old. But notice him when Uncle appears on the scene. Uncle is loud-mouthed and monopolizes the conversation. Both Mummy and Daddy are interested in what he has to say. But it is all above Benny's head. Therefore, he is bored. He may drop his food, brandish his spoon or what not. He may even resentfully poke or slap Uncle. The fault of such behavior obviously rests on the adults' shoulders, yet Benny is the one who gets the scolding.

By no means am I suggesting that Benny should be allowed to be the chief actor on the stage. There is nothing more unpleasant than the child who whiningly interrupts every attempt that the grownups make to have their own discussion. If he is receiving enough attention from time to time, he should be taught to be quiet unless he wants something or can add to the subject. This is true even of older children.

For example, a girl of twelve may be allowed to join the family at supper when a very intimate friend is their guest. If Mother and her friend are commenting on topics way beyond Betty's ken, she should remain silent. For her to interrupt with a play for her Mother's notice by such remarks as, "Mama, I don't like this dessert. I want chocolate," shows incredibly bad bringing up. It is exceedingly annoying to the guest who then feels that she is an intruder. But just as there is no reason for not helping the tiny child when necessary, so listening to the older children's views every now and then is the responsibility of the parents.

With tact, youngsters can be drawn into the conversation occasionally, thus flattering them and easing the atmosphere. That is, there is a middle road between neglecting the child for company and permitting it to spoil the visit of its parents' friends. But it is up to the adults to set the pace. For I reiterate that lack of courtesy between adults and children can and does make for unnecessary rifts in their associations.

But if the aversion for a certain person does persist in the child's mind, it is doubtless worth analyzing. It may be the parents' fault; they may have made some incautious remark which prejudiced the child beforehand. Or the guest may be in the wrong; he or she may have approached the child clumsily. Children are easily won if tackled unobtrusively but rarely if a stranger literally or verbally grabs them. Again, the visitor may be a really nasty individual; hidden traits may possibly be sensed more quickly by innocent youngsters than more sophisticated adults. Too, children express themselves in manner and speech more openly than adults.

If the fault lies with the child, it may be unreasonable jealousy. For children are jealous of their prerogatives, especially in regard to those whom they love. Or there may have been a misunderstanding. The child may have overheard a remark and misinterpreted it, as for instance, that a woman friend of Mother's does not want children of her own, from which the child assumes that she has no use for any children. There are all kinds of illogical reasons that the childish mind can fabricate for not liking a person: because he wears a color that the youngster hates, or because he has a beard and is bald headed like the Turk in the storybook. Who can fathom the complexity of youthful minds? Certainly not adults who can hardly remember their own childhood! We can but search patiently for a solution when such problems arise.

If it is possible to sift out the reason for a child's animosity, we may also be able to change it, particu-

larly if it is based primarily on prejudice. But this cannot be accomplished by ordering the child to like so and so: affection does not come at command. Patient explanation which analyzes the aversion in language comprehensible to the child is likely to be much more effective. This remedy sounds simple but it is not. There is nothing harder than to reach a child's level without talking down to him which would but add insult to injury. If the child has justification, the parent can also teach tolerance by acknowledging it. But due care must be taken not to destroy judgment. There is no harm in trying to show a child that under ordinary circumstances we need to adapt ourselves amicably to those whom we meet, whether or not they attract us.

We can point out that there is usually some good in everyone which fact does not need to blind us to their imperfections. We can explain to them that nobody is flawless on this earth, supporting our statements by the familiar saying that we like people in spite of their faults, not because of them. All these are lessons worth learning but how often is the opportunity grasped? Instead, the child is pitilessly reprimanded for rude behavior which has hurt its parents' pride.

Above all, there should never be any ill-feeling towards the child by the parents or their friends, irrespective of the nature of the outburst. It is decidedly silly for so-called intelligent grownups to harbor any malice toward a youngster. Then, indeed, they are putting themselves on a par with the children, in the least intelligent way. For such equality is a question of catering to their own pride in a childish manner, not treating the youngsters like reasonable human beings. Harboring resentment because of the outspoken reactions of children should be beneath the dignity of supposedly sensible adults.

Undeniably, personal choice as to companionship is the right of every human being, children included, and should be acknowledged. It may be unfortunate if children do not like their parents' friends but it is not an act of guilt. Their appraisal may have absolutely no foundation, nevertheless it must be accepted. If Jimmie wishes to go to see his friend, because Miss S. whom he hates is coming for lunch, is this such an offense? After all, it is really more appropriate for him to be with his contemporary, is it not? If he does not want to be shown off to his mother's friend like an animal in the zoo, must he be deemed anti-social? Can we not just admit that his tastes differ? He, too, has the privilege of selection. Why should this not be considered?

The world is full of an infinite variety of people, some of whom appeal to one person, some to another. There is no reason why this should not be so; in fact, if we liked everybody equally our emotions would be either boringly stagnate or would cause a tremendous amount of trouble. It is the very diversity of our relationships which make life interesting. Why then should we limit children's social contacts? Why ask them to tacitly accept everybody who crosses their path? Is it not better to permit them to exercise their own judgment even if they take it into their heads to ignore their parents' best friends? At least, this shows that they are not insipid creatures but are capable of developing their own train of thought. In the end, is not this independence more valuable than meek conformity to family patterns?

There is, however, another aspect of the problem which the parent ought not fail to grasp. These reactions of the child toward the parents' friends can really be of immense value if properly utilized. Anyone who has had contact with children knows how sensitive they are to adult reactions toward them. They may imagine themselves disliked. For example, in a child's school career, one is almost sure to bump up against the following. Eight-year-old Peggy announces:

"Teacher was mean to me. She doesn't like me."

Now, instead of Mother saying as she usually does: "Oh, Peggy, you're wrong. Grownups don't have favorites." she should reply:

"Well, do you like everybody? Don't you remember that you wanted to go out when such and such a person was here? You wouldn't even come into the room to say, "How do you do."

This is bringing very concretely to the child's attention that some people attract you and some do not. The quicker a child learns this lesson, the less its feelings will be hurt when it is not the favorite.

Of course, it can be worked the other way around. Tommy's father has a business acquaintance as a guest. He has been there before and Tommy was extremely bored with their conversation. The man, a bachelor, had never dealt with boys and unintentionally offended Tommy by talking down to him. He did not realize his offense, for he liked Tommy and was being nice according to his lights. On his second visit to the family there is also present an uncle whom Tommy adores. The youngster spies this uncle first and rushes right up to him but refuses to speak to the other guest. This is no time for a scene but the mother can cleverly present the situation as an example later on. She can say:

"Tommy, do you think that your conduct was polite? Wasn't it rude to pay all of your attention to your Uncle?"

If Tommy answers as he probably will:

"But I like him and I hate that other man!" he has walked straight into the trap set for him. Then the wise mother can add:

"Do you remember how hurt you were because three of the other boys were invited by the teacher for an outing and you were left out?"

"Aw Ma, that's different. I didn't want to be teacher's pet in class. That's why he left me out."

"In one sense it is different but in another it is just the same. Both are a question of discrimination. Teacher discriminated against you and you discriminated against Father's friend. Such treatment hurts personal feelings."

This is another way of presenting the need of courtesy. For we cannot deliberately encourage children to be rude. Manners are but a social veneer, but they do aid in smoothing out the tangles of human relationship. In stating that children may avoid their parents' friends if they wish to, I do not mean that any impoliteness should be ignored when they do meet, whether accidentally or on purpose. I simply hold that if children prefer staying out of the way, even if it is only upstairs, parents should accept this decision. This is not leniency but respect for their moods even though the adult may not understand the reason.

But I am convinced that courtesy must be taught because it really denotes consideration for others. There must be some attempt to make children polite to everybody irrespective of their fondness or dislike for them. Society as it is constituted today demands this and we must prepare children to take their place in the social

system. To permit children to express themselves at the expense of grownups is as selfish a way to train them as was the old-fashioned manner of bringing them up to act like automatic dolls. The child who is not even allowed to say, "excuse me," when it bumps into somebody is as bad as the repressed Miss of yesterday with her interminable curtsies and folded hands. There is, of course, the danger when teaching children good manners that they will feel hypocritical. This is why I would capitalize the idea of thoughtfulness rather than the actual motions *per se*.

On the other hand, it is unfair to tax the youngster unduly. For instance, if four-year-old Bobby goes to Mother's friend for lunch she may say before they start: "It is polite to eat everything placed before you."

But if a dish comes which Bobby does not know and he looks at it suspiciously, forthwith announcing: "I don't know what that it; we don't have it in my house," Mother would be very foolish to get angry with Bobby. He is not intentionally rude, just curious. Certainly the friend would be very stupid if she took offense. Any such remark on her part, as "Bobby, I won't ask you again since you don't like our food," shows little knowledge of children. Yet such is sometimes the reaction.

It is foolish, too, to be upset when Miss One-Year-Old ignores the toy that a loving friend brings, preferring to play with a trifle of its own. But many a Mother watches such a performance in trepidation that the friend's feelings will be hurt. And incredible as it seems, they sometimes are, as is evident by the remark, "It doesn't matter," said in a tone that denotes that it really does.

To summarize, then, parents' friends should have contact with their children only in so far as they are welcome. Furthermore, any grownup dealing with children must be thick-skinned. There must not be any rancor at the appalling frankness of children, whether it denotes a temporary or a permanent attitude. In a word, adults must learn to take children's reactions toward themselves impersonally and with apparent indifference.

Fact, Fancy, Truth

HERBERT STURGES

Science is inclined to have a period of flirtation with new truth before settling down to marriage with facts. This propensity for romance pervades many regions of human activity.

An artist with a new subject makes a sketch or a series of sketches, gradually selecting the forms he desires. Social progress may arise from a fanciful ideal of what "ought to be." If there is a place for this thought to grow, the ideal may ultimately become a reality.

Just as love includes all phases of friendship, truth is broad enough to take in the new hypotheses of science and the utopian visions of social dreamers. Great oaks from little acorns grow. The wisdom of useful, harmonious social institutions does not usually spring full grown like Athene from the brain of Zeus, but may originate in a chance perception of a fertile imagination.

The pioneer in the wilderness notices the intersection of two valleys. Here the highways of the future will meet, and a town or city will arise. Social progress depends in part on the intuitive picturing of desirable possibilities.

The explorer does not usually wait for the city to grow. As soon as a few settlers reach the favored spot he packs up and wanders forth into his beloved wilderness. The spirit of research is love of the unknown. The body of established facts is surrounded by an atmosphere of uncertainty. Each generation of science brings new reaching out into the regions of ignorance, finding new relationships among particles of matter, in the cells of living organisms, and in the complex patterns of societal organization.

In our present-day society, as always in the past, many minds are seeking needed new truth. The weakening and decay of our political institutions is shown by the destructive conflicts of passionate nationalisms. So our experiments with political wisdom include the United Nations, and World Federalism with its purpose of making the United Nations a World Federal Government.

These explorations in political affairs are, I believe, largely manifestations of the inadequacy of our economic institutions. Political organizations are not only political, but have deep-rooted economic motivation. The fundamental factors of social experience are the needs for daily bread, the material comforts of family life, the opportunities for work and play. In a world of too many people, competitive economic enterprise yields relative security for only a minority of the people of the world, with the majority struggling constantly for a bare subsistence.

Political strategy is often the expression of general economic insecurity largely due to "population pressure," which means that there are too many mouths to feed, too many backs to be clothed, too many people to supply from the products of agriculture and industry. Hence the suggestion for World Technocracy, a world government planning and working for balance between productive capacity and the consuming population.

Man is potentially a kindhearted and generous being, friendly and cooperative. We also have plenty of meanness in us when our economic interests are threatened by scarcity and insecurity. The ruthless brutality of war echoes the struggle for survival in the primeval jungle. Our desire for new social wisdom and truth can find some hope and guidance in the principles of economic and biological welfare suggested in a social utopia of World Techno-democracy, with world politico-economic affairs technically operated, democratically controlled.

Having outlined some of the credits due to the exploring imagination, is it necessary to turn to the darker side of the life of this faculty? We can be cheerful about fancy's contribution to science and social progress, but fanciful notions sometimes distract

our attention from truth, and hinder the free working of wisdom.

When the early Protestants invented the idea of the authority of the Bible as a substitute for Mother Church, they grasped a very weak reed. Besides a great deal that is true and interesting, the Bible contains quantities of ancient folklore, antiquated philosophy, and worn-out science. Yes, Theology is a science. It tells how to get things done by appeal to supernatural powers which can be of great aid to man by special concessions to the righteous, and by miraculous intervention in the processes of nature and society. Often such science works wonderfully well. We pray for rain and it rains! We pray for father to get well, and in a few days he is up from his bed of sickness, back on the job.

This is all very fine, but there are too many exceptions. What the ancients hailed as the helpful favors of deity seem to have been the selected cases where their science succeeded. Modern man is rapidly learning not to depend on it, and is steadily replacing it by the more substantial modern sciences of matter, life, and society.

Our growing body of reliable information about the processes of nature crowds theological science into the dust bin of discarded ideas. What were mysteries to the people of Bible times—the weather, sickness and health, the achievements of man—are emerging from the shadows. The causal sequences in these processes of man's environment, his body, and his success or failure in life are being increasingly illuminated by the growing light of scientific truth. The test of utility can hardly leave us doubtful of the relative value of the ideas of our ancestors and of our own times for saving man from evil, and for promoting health, welfare, and happiness.

Under these conditions many of the tales told in the Bible are no longer acceptable as facts. What was true for antiquity is not true today. The ancient beliefs and the ancient dependence on supernatural powers are for us not wisdom but folly. So we say: The idea of deity is fanciful; heaven is not a real place, but part of ancient mythology; we do not believe in miracles of healing, nor special providence for devout churchgoers.

Perhaps we feel we have to be gentle and courteous to our old folks who cling to such purely fanciful notions as salvation by the crucifixion of Jesus, and personal immortality; and not too outspoken in our discussions with those who still actively proclaim these ideas. But some frank talk to advocates of the "old-time religion" is in order. It is like reproving a child whose conduct seems to be wrong; we can speak softly, but we must say what we think. Gently but firmly we can tell the truth as we see it.

The exploring imagination is a very necessary part of the growth of science and the progress of society. But the romantic ideology of ancient religion has no place in the mentality of modern man.

More and more we must turn for our source of wisdom and truth not to Mother Church, not to the Bible, but to the teachers of modern scientific knowledge; to our universities which support their activities; and to the great learned societies of health, education, psychology, economics, and sociology, which publish their conclusions.

The Dynamics of Good Will

DAVID JOBMAN

At a conference in Rollins College, sometime ago, the following statement was adopted:

> The atomic bomb and other applications of science and technology to modern warfare have made it so destructive that the outbreak of another major war must be prevented.
>
> Atomic secrets cannot be kept for more than a few years by any nation or small group of nations; nor can there be any adequate military defense against a surprise attack capable of paralyzing the country and peoples attacked.

Among others signing this statement were: S. K. Allison, Chairman of the Institute of Nuclear Studies, University of Chicago; Professor Albert Einstein; Alexander Meiklejohn, former President of Amherst College; Emery Reves, author of *The Anatomy of Peace*.

Something went amiss and the frightful race is on again. Following two most devastating World Wars, the old too-familiar sad story repeats itself. The world is being split asunder. Power politics and concomitant alliances, universal conscription, bigger armies, mightier navies, more striking air forces, secret stockpiles of atomic bombs and missiles reveal the dreadful truth that once more we are living in a dangerously divided world which seeks security on the shifting sands of violence and brute force. In the Balkans, in the Middle East, in distant Pacific waters, the cauldron is brewing and the world stage is getting set for another horrible experience that may spell the utter self-annihilation of our civilization. The cataclysmic rise and fall of old and modern tyrannies, from ancient Egypt to present-day Germany, all built on violence and oppression, should have impressed our age with the great lesson that the sword is treacherous and brute force invites its own destruction. Yet, somehow, as in the tragic days of yesterday, mankind is on the march again approaching fast another trial with consequences too frightful to contemplate. What went amiss?

There is no rational escape from reality and its regrettable procrastinations. Long after the world's mightiest battles have been fought and won, the victors are still ill at ease. The Council of Foreign Ministers of the Big Three and the lesser many meet; they are busy and harangue vociferously; they adjourn, without having reached those basic agreements which are indispensable to the orderly process of civilized life. The Allied Control Councils hit frequent snags, impeding readjustments which must be made. Even the United Nations, still in labor-pains as a going concern, are far from being "united" and cause real concern to all friends of law and order. As to the dreadful potentialities involved in a divided world and an indiscriminate exploitation of uranium and thorium, the above quotations from the world's leading physicists make perfectly clear that another trial by arms threatens the very physical existence of our civilization. What relief or enlightenment can we obtain from the world's political leadership? Says Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, who has had access to its inner sanctum: "The gold dust thrown in all our eyes by political abracadabra only confuses, with

gain to no one except temporary power to the economic magicians."

Is there any wonder that fear and hysteria show their ugly heads again, leaving the average citizen confused; victim to his own unfounded premonitions steeped in bias, or vacillating at the crossroads, pressed by personal insecurity and those imponderable problems which stumble the mightiest and the wisest. What has happened? Bluntly, the missing link is traced to the apparent phenomenon that there is no good will in sight —good will not as a moral platitude, but as a dynamic factor of progressive living, vitally affecting the lives of mankind, irrespective of color, creed, or language spoken. It is as elementary as that, if we dare to challenge our own inhibitions. At this stage of human history it is of great importance to ask again and again: Are we, as individuals, as citizens, as members of trade, business, and labor associations devotees of good will? That is the real key to all our confusion, the major obstacle to all our constructive efforts, the cause of most of our domestic and world heartaches and failures. Upon the stage of life the disposition of the actor governs his successful role. Sternly, then, with a hand of even justice, we must assert good will by the stamping out of those social forces which breed disunion, hatred, and strife. An enlightened public and world opinion can and will do the seemingly impossible.

By the very nature of things, our spheres are limited —geography, language, color and custom—each leaves its heavy imprint, acting as a brake, upon the individual, group, and nation. We cannot undertake to dictate to all the members of the Council of Foreign Ministers, or the Allied Control Committees, or the United Nations the rules of good will, which would operate as by remote control in accordance with a moral will impelling them and the peoples they represent to shed all fears, jealousies, and prejudices. But as a self-respecting alert and independent unit of the family of nations we can in our own homes, offices, mines, fields, and factories make a concerted honest effort to rid ourselves in an orderly democratic manner of all those sores and apprehensions which make us a house divided against itself and a subject of censure to outsiders. Our best investment is in peace and universal prosperity, and in comparison with the titanic costs of war we know that peace, indeed, is very cheap and its demands most fair and reasonable. It is the spirit of rudeness, wickedness, and evil that mounts the obstacles obstructing unity and hindering the ministrations of kindness and fellowship, at home and abroad. By permitting the dynamics of good will to flow more fully in the affairs of man, discord is banished and the very possibility of strife is outlawed. Thus, for the weapons of mass destruction we shall display in its full glamor the unbounded beneficence of an unlimited friendship inviting all to its portals. By manifesting our moral prowess of a people truly united, we can more strongly set the contagious example for the nations of the world to behold our "good works," accepting in full faith our leadership as "the light of the world," guiding mankind in a humaner way from the ill-effects of disunity and haunting fears and closer towards creative unity, which is based on universal education emitting the healing rays of good will. Such guidance is positive direct action of the noblest brand, fully in accord with the spirit and very letter of our American heritage.

We have heard of revolutions—social, political, and economic. Yet the greatest revolution that underlies and motivates all other recorded upheavals is the invisible revolution which works unmistakably and irrepressibly day and night throughout the years and ages within the hearts of mankind, making the other revolutions possible. The classics of the world's literature, the histories of great nations who have left their indelible marks upon generations, the biographies of humanity's greatest and best in all walks of creative life—they all tell the same beautiful story of the great revolution which makes man master of his own destiny,—a destiny built upon the impregnable fortress of good will. The fate of nations and the blood of martyrs all tell the inescapable tale: as long as man's heart has not been cleansed by the moral waters of that revolutionary tide which sweeps within the channels of moral law and order, all his other plans and efforts and hopes are of no avail—futile, at best; dangerously destructive, at their worst. That accounts for our failures and disappointments, despite the great victories made.

We must take the closer range. The twin scourge of oppression and tyranny can legislate and terrorize peoples into a goose-stepping unanimity, but it cannot guarantee its own security with impunity. Benito Mussolini and Adolph Hitler and the gallows following the Nuremberg trial have made that vividly clear for all times, lest future oppressors forget. No ideological mask shall ever again hide the crimes of aggressive despotisms. An aroused, enlightened humanity will see to it that justice is done.

But we must also remember that nations cannot legislate confidence, generosity, and good will by decree. These pillars of enduring world peace and creative harmony must emanate from the heart, radiate from the free soul, and permeate every contact with our fellow men. This is the way of free men proudly erecting the Better Life in a free world. How is this to be stimulated and how are we to avert the paralyzing catastrophe of another struggle with its dire afflictions? Who will help us now, in this most urgent hour of universal need, before it becomes too late to dam the flood of seething passions?

The peace-loving peoples of the world have only one course to pursue: the appeal is to reason and to a living conscience, doing no violence to our faith in humanity and the ultimate materialization of the humaner community of nations embracing all mankind. Unlike the methods of totalitarian despotisms, which must have their spies and concentration camps and slaves and mute guards armed to the teeth, the peace-loving peoples will use as their weapons the textbooks and the school; the free pulpits and the happy homes; the radio and the free press; their very places of employment, business, and recreation will become the primary factors or social dynamos which will generate enlightenment and good will, removing all fears. Together, under the banner of the United Nations, we shall manifest a truly united and activated moral front which no tyranny or combination of evil powers will dare to resist or to hinder. Idyllic as it may sound, this is not Utopia; it is an everyday program of living and aspiring in a rational world order. With a working good will towards all, we shall thus be able to counteract all the encroachments and plottings of alien ideologies in quest of fertile soil. The world at large and the friends of democracy will call it The American Way, the way of law and order and unbiased justice; the only way that can make world peace and human happiness come true. Directly, the dynamics of good will will supply the missing link which humanity,

steeped for centuries in ignorance and blinded by passion, has failed to acquire. The ascent from primordial infancy and darkness has been a most laborious undertaking; but this Promethean task of daring and planning and achievement has come to fruition. Its success was heralded and well-mapped out for our emulation nineteen centuries ago. Said the Dreamer in his all-inclusive moral imperative, offering individual happiness and abiding world peace: "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets."

Only a close adherence to this incontrovertible moral imperative may yet save the race of man from the dreadful visitations of warfare in an atomic age, whose threshold man in his daring has braved to cross, but failed to own.

The Gospel of the Advertiser

E. P. HERMAN

Many years ago Joseph Conrad wrote a story called *The Anarchist,* in which he said a very significant and interesting thing. This applies with such startling force to present-day ideals in advertising that it is worth repeating:

> Being myself animated by feeling of affection toward my fellow men, I am saddened by the modern system of advertising. Whatever evidence it offers of enterprise, ingenuity, impudence and resource in certain individuals, it proves to my mind the wide prevalence of that form of mental degradation which is called gullibility.

Even the most violent critic of modern advertising ethics will admit that there has been a steady though rather slow improvement in the morals of advertisers, particularly among those who have the more expensive articles to offer. It is almost exclusively among the smaller and cheaper commodity manufacturers that one finds the greatest and most flagrant violations of common decency and truth in the printed statement. The number and variety of these small articles and the makers of them are so numerous, the competition among them so intense, that the sponsor of any new but similar product must find some novel peculiarity to exploit rather than any inherent qualities which his product may possess.

Among the many manufacturers of small articles the greatest violators of ethics in advertising are the makers of toothpastes, antiseptics, cigarettes, and soaps. It is through their combined and enormous advertising campaigns that the average person has received the impression that most advertisements are untruthful.

Let us consider toothpastes as an example. It is generally agreed among dentists that there is but one function that any toothpaste can ever serve—and that is to clean teeth—merely and solely to clean teeth, and nothing else. These were the claims of the first makers of toothpastes, and for the honest toothpaste manufacturer this is still the only claim. But when, with the improvement of methods for manufacturing, numerous other toothpastes began to flood the market, in addition to those already on the drugstore shelves, some special value had to be found to sell each one. A new magical, if non-existent, property had to be imparted. The adfiction writers got busy, and wonderful qualities were attributed to the new toothpastes. Some contained emitin hydrochloride and pepsin to digest the film from the teeth; others contained potent and marvelous antiseptics to suffocate pyorrhea germs; still others contained alkalis of different kinds to counteract mouth acidity which is a harmless condition anyway. Then there were toothpastes with astringents bearing weird names to harden and toughen the gums which bled too easily. Some of these toothpastes were white, but many had new colors: some were yellow, some were green, and others were a pale pink. They had all varieties of tastes and odors. The number and kinds of medicaments incorporated in them were astonishing: iodine, chlorophyll, milk of magnesia, fruit juices, and all sorts of antiseptics.

Because of this mass of awful lies people began to believe that toothpastes could be made to work wonders in all sorts of mouth disorders, that they could prevent tooth decay, and that a clean tooth was a healthy tooth. Yet, in spite of what toothpaste makers will say to the contrary, dental authorities agree that a toothpaste, any toothpaste that was ever made and that anyone could ever hope to make, no matter who and where, can do but one thing, and that is merely clean teeth. Moreover, there are in every household commonplace chemicals which will clean teeth just as efficiently as any toothpaste; these are ordinary table salt and bicarbonate of soda. It is true that they are not quite as tasty as toothpaste, but they accomplish the purpose just as well. They clean teeth.

Conceded, then, that a toothpaste only cleans teeth, let us consider what a clean tooth really is. Does a clean tooth never decay, as one maker of toothpaste claims? The cleanest tooth in the cleanest mouth will decay, and some of them with startling rapidity. Clean teeth do not always mean healthy teeth. It is something more than cleanliness which prevents dental caries. It is some inherent metabolism of the human body—the mobilization and utilization of certain elements—which give some people strong teeth and others teeth which decay easily. In mouths that have never known a toothbrush are some of the soundest teeth. Among certain races whose diet is rich in calcium, phosphorous, and other essential elements, dental caries is at a minimum or entirely absent. Some of the people of the highlands of Scotland have the soundest teeth in the world, due to a well-balanced diet; for they have few dentists and still fewer toothpastes.

So in order to sell their wares, the makers and sellers of modern toothpastes appeal to a gullible public by pretty, catchy phrases, flimsy mouthings of pseudo-science rather than by telling the truth.

Next to the makers of toothpastes, the makers of antiseptics are the biggest liars. Of course, everyone knows that germs are terrible little creatures which work harm and must be destroyed at all costs. There are many different kinds of germs, and in these days almost as many different kinds of germ killers. But the ideal antiseptic is not yet being made, in spite of what the advertisements may say. To physicians the ideal antiseptic is that which is capable of killing all germs without in the least harming the cells of the body. It is quite easy to concoct an antiseptic which will kill all germs, but the difficulty arises in the fact that the cells of the body will be killed at the same time. Carbolic acid is

a wonderful germ killer, but if one attempts to use it to eliminate germs from the human body disastrous results are apt to follow.

More often it is ordinary common sense which helps greatly in preventing infection from germs rather than the use of fancy and high-priced antiseptics. In a series of experiments conducted by an eminent surgeon in New York, who has had considerable experience in the combating of infections, it was found that the best preliminary treatment for infected wounds was the mechanical cleansing with plain soap and water followed by the application of a reliable antiseptic. Strange as it may seem, the most potent antiseptic was found to be one with which the general public is not acquainted, but which is quite well known to physicians. It was Dichloramine-T which apparently does not need heavy advertising to demonstrate its real worth. Another antiseptic and good germ killer is plain, ordinary tincture of iodine, which does not require high-pressure advertising to make it known. It is an ironic fact that all the antiseptics about which you and I are constantly reading in the advertisements are very far down in the list. They do not seem to be of very much value in controlling germ growth or killing germs, in spite of extensive advertising. I have often found that the really worthwhile things in life do not need much shouting to make known their virtues.

The tragedy in the whole business of antiseptics lies in the fact that people are led to believe that they are buying immunity from germs by using widely heralded antiseptics, and that a few meaningless rituals with these antiseptics will prevent serious disease. The truth is that killing germs in the mouth, or nose, or on the hands, or in any other parts of the body which advertisers recommend, will not really help matters much. It is the body's defensive mechanism which has a great deal to do with how a certain germ will react in the body. Germs are nothing more than very little plants or animals which are constantly floating around in the air and which we will always have with us in spite of all the antiseptics there are. Once they have gained a foothold an antiseptic cannot do very much. The outcome will depend on the white blood cells, the greatest germ killers there are. Upon their integrity depends life and happiness. A thorough understanding of their action is necessary to explain why some people die from a slight infection like a pinprick while others survive whose lungs are almost solid with germs and pus as the result of a pneumonic infection.

There is no doubt that you have read at one time or another that the human mouth is the filthiest part of the human body. It contains almost every germ that one can think of. A bite from a human being is just as fatal in many instances as a bite from a mad dog. Yet nothing startling seems to happen to the possessor of the germ-laden mouth. Antiseptics will temporarily inhibit the growth of these germs. The important factor, however, is the inherent ability of the human body to take care of these invaders. Antiseptics do not really affect most germs in any appreciable manner.

The advertisements of the cigarette makers are among the most amusing and certainly among the most deceiving. Yet the fact remains that one twenty-cent pack of cigarettes is pretty much the same as another twenty-cent pack of cigarettes, no matter who puts it out. Toasting, roasting, cooking, and fancy cellophane wrappers do not impart magical qualities to twenty-cent cigarette tobacco.

Medical authorities have devoted a great deal of study to smoking and what it does to the human body. Moderate smoking, no matter what tobacco is smoked, is a comparatively harmless procedure. Excessive smoking of any kind of tobacco will bring about disagreeable symptoms. It will always irritate the lining of the throat and cause coughing. As a matter of fact, inhaling any kind of smoke will irritate and cause a person to cough. Tobacco smoke, in spite of the fact that it is inhaled voluntarily, is an irritant.

The makers of soaps are also addicted to telling tall stories in their advertisements. Among them, as among the makers of toothpastes, pseudo-scientific advertising statements are rampant. Not a few of them are so obviously untrue and disgustingly ridiculous that advertising men with a conscience have asked for reform. One of these, Eugene Forker, general director of the International Magazine Company, has been quoted as stating in part: "Judging from some of the advertising copy from the toilet goods industry that I have seen in recent months I don't believe that the time is far off when they will cure cancer with face creams."

Printer's Ink, in an editorial comment on the false claims which the toilet goods industry is so addicted to making in their ads, says:

> Cancer can't be cured with face creams. Divorce evils can't be remedied with face powders. Passionate perfumes and wedded bliss aren't synonymous. Acrimonious advertising isn't the road to public belief. Pseudo-scientific claims make a weak foundation for a lasting business.

To discuss the fake claims made in the public press about the great variety of toilet articles now offered to the public would require a volume of many pages. Soap which is the most popular toilet article will suffice as an illustration. In consideration of the widely proclaimed virtues of the various kinds of soaps one sees advertised, it is well to know what soap really does and was originally intended to do. Soap is intended solely for the purpose of mechanical cleansing and nothing else. Any soap which claims to do anything else is making a false claim.

First it should be stated that there is no soap which can actually kill germs. The soaps containing the strongest antiseptics are weak in their germ-destroying powers. In order to carry out a satisfactory disinfection of the hands an antiseptic in liquid form is necessary; soap will never do. The health of the skin depends upon the general health of the body, and no soap will create a desirable complexion if the body is in a poor state of health.

As for body odors it will take more than mere soap to correct them. It is first necessary to find out to what these odors are due and then remove these causes. There certainly is no one soap which has the specific property of destroying body odors.

This, then, seems to be the advertising plank of the manufacturer of small commodities. He is apparently engaged in a business in which the truth in print is sacrificed for more and better sales. How much longer he will be able to deceive the public remains to be seen. That the time is limited seems likely, for many people are becoming disgusted with the different-hued lies that are so commonly used to sell cigarettes, toothpastes, antiseptics, and soaps. It is time for the advertising profession to acquire a badly needed code of ethics.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

MRS. CHARLES A. HAYCOCK

The death of Lou Haycock (Mrs. Charles A.) on October 5th is a great loss to the Unitarian movement and particularly to the Western Unitarian Conference. As a Director and Regional Vice-President of the General Alliance she was most helpful in cooperating with the Western Conference. In time of need she assisted by working in the Conference office and from 1944-47 she was a member of its Board. For several years Mrs. Haycock was Registrar of the Midwest Unitarian Summer Assembly — the Lake Geneva Conference. Through these contacts she came to know and to be loved by a multitude of Unitarians throughout the country.

Mrs. Haycock maintained her interest in Unitarian affairs and people to the very end. Just two weeks prior to her death I visited her. The entire conversation was devoted to the answering of her keen questions concerning persons, churches, and issues in the Unitarian movement. Her interest and her influence were always found on the side of progress.

Those of us who had the opportunity to know Mrs. Haycock intimately in personal as well as official relationships always found her a sympathetic and understanding listener, a kind and wise counselor, a cheerful and inspiring example. Truly the absence of Lou Haycock "leaves a lonesome place" in many lives.

GENEVA 1950

The dates for the Geneva Conference of the summer of 1950 have been set for August 20-27. The planning boards of the youth and adult sections met the four days following Thanksgiving. The meetings were held at the Meadville Theological School in Chicago.

GENEVA YOUTH SECTION

Six of the seven members of the planning council met in Chicago, November 25-26. Rev. Arnold Westwood, minister of the Unitarian Church in Urbana, Illinois, was elected Youth Director. Mr. Westwood served as the assistant director last year. Plans were made for an exceptional series of discussions, lectures, and activity workshops.

Members of the planning council present were Nancy Jack, Mission, Kansas, chairman; Margaret Guenther, Detroit, Michigan; Mike Shoup, Chicago, Illinois; Al Johnson, Detroit, Michigan; Pete Matthey, Davenport, Iowa; and Chris Moore, Detroit, Michigan. Margaret Beach of Cleveland, Ohio, was unable to be present. Mr. Leon Hopper, Field Worker for the American Unitarian Youth, sat in on the sessions. Randall S. Hilton, Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, served as adult advisor.

GENEVA ADULT SECTION

The Board of the Midwest Unitarian Summer Assembly met in Chicago, November 27-28. A full and well-rounded program providing for an increase in the number of religious education courses was outlined. Rev. Randall S. Hilton was reëlected Administrative Dean. Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Rockford, Illinois, was elected Program Director. Other leaders appointed were Mrs. Kenneth Casson and Miss Pauline Daly, Recreational Directors; Mr. Oscar Quimby, Junior High Leader; Rev. Philip Schug, Junior Leader. The organized program for juniors and junior high will be planned by their respective leaders. Mr. Howard Hauze was made Director of Publicity and Public Relations.

Under organizational changes recommended by the Administrative Dean, the Program Director will be in complete charge of the faculty and program of the conference. The Administrative Dean will have charge of all administrative and business affairs.

Members of the planning board who were present included Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Chairman, Rockford, Illinois; Mr. Oscar Quimby, Vice-Chairman, Cincinnati, Ohio; Mrs. Bernard Heinrich, Secretary, Oak Park, Illinois; Mr. Fritz Schaefer, Treasurer, Indianapolis, Indiana; Rev. Philip Schug, Lincoln, Nebraska; Mr. and Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, Chicago, Illinois; Mrs. Kenneth Casson, Rockford, Illinois; Mrs. Robert Lawson, Dayton, Ohio; Miss Nancy Jack, Mission, Kansas. The Youth Director, Rev. Arnold Westwood, of Urbana, Illinois, participated in the sessions.

The 1950 program for both the youth and the adults promises to be one of the best. Because of the excellence of the program, the limitations on the accommodations, and the contractual arrangements with College Camp, early registrations are encouraged. Those who wish to select their accommodations must have registered by July 15. Early registrations which may have to be cancelled will be refunded if such cancellations are made prior to July 15. Registrations should be sent to Mrs. Esther Heinrich, 629 S. Grove Street, Oak Park, Illinois. The registration fee is $5.00. The rates at the camp will be the same as last year.

IOWA ASSOCIATION

The Iowa Unitarian Association held its annual meetings in Davenport October 31 and November 1. The Judy Lecturer was Rabbi Jacob Weinstein of Chicago. Speakers at other sessions of the conference included Rev. Charles Phillips, minister at Des Moines, Iowa; Rev. Arthur Foote, minister at St. Paul, Minnesota; and Dr. Merrill Bush, Division of Adult Education and Social Relations of the American Unitarian Association; Rev. Randall S. Hilton; Miss Lois McColloch, and Mrs. George Piekson. Dr. Raymond B. Bragg of the Unitarian Service Committee was the banquet speaker.

Mr. Roman Hruska and Mr. Franklin Brown were reëlected President and Treasurer.

DAYTON

Rev. Robert Lawson was installed as minister of the First Unitarian Church of Dayton, Sunday afternoon, November 13. Participating in the program were Rev. Ellsworth Smith, First Church in Cincinnati; Rev. Julius F. Krolfifer, St. John's Church in Cincinnati; and Rev. Edgar Lee Jones of Yellow Springs, Ohio.

The welcome to the Conference was given by Rev. Randall S. Hilton; the welcome to the city by Mayor Louis W. Lohrey. Dr. Edwin H. Wilson gave the charge to the minister and the congregation. The sermon was delivered by Dr. Curtis W. Reese, President of the Western Unitarian Conference. Mr. Jones and Dr. Wilson are former ministers of the Dayton church.

URBANA

The Urbana church has completed the excavation of the basement and the equipping of its new church

school and recreational facilities. Dedication services will be held December 16-18. Dr. Frederick May Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association, will be the principal speaker.

The Unitarian and Universalist churches of Urbana have combined their student programs. They are jointly conducting graduate and undergraduate student organizations. The program has been achieved through the cooperative leadership of Rev. Arnold Westwood of the Unitarian church and Rev. Earl Engle of the Universalist church.

SHELBYVILLE

The Shelbyville church has been holding monthly services. They have been conducted this fall by Robert Turner of St. Louis, former minister at Shelbyville and Hinsdale, Illinois; Dr. John G. Gill, Alton, Illinois, and Rev. Arnold Westwood. Plans have been made for the services to continue during the winter and spring months under the leadership of ministers from the Chicago area.

DULUTH

The Duluth Unitarian church has had a very successful year even though they have not had a minister. Under wholly lay leadership, reports made at the annual meeting on November 7th told of the outstanding success of their monthly church services, their weekly discussion groups and book review meetings. The basement has been completely redecorated and major repairs made to the building. A church school has been functioning weekly. The chairman of the Board during the past year was Miss Hilda Ringsred.

MILWAUKEE

Dr. Ralph Bailey reports an increase in the church membership and in the average attendance at church services. A new woman's organization which meets in the evenings, known as the Emerson Club, has been established.

The Women's Alliance of the church had Rev. Randall S. Hilton speak on "Inside Unitarianism" at its October meeting. It entertained the Chicago Associate Alliance in November. The Rev. Fred I. Cairns was the speaker. At their December meeting they plan to have Dr. Frederick May Eliot.

MADISON

The First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin, has begun the construction of its new building designed by Frank Lloyd Wright. Stone for the new building has been loaded and unloaded by the members of the church. In a very real sense the new building will be the result of the work of its minister and members.

BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS

The First Unitarian Church of Bloomington, Illinois, celebrated its 90th anniversary on Sunday, October 30. Participating in the program were Rev. Earl Engle of the Universalist church of Urbana, Illinois; Rev. Arnold Westwood, of the Unitarian Church of Urbana, Illinois; Dr. William J. Arms of the Universalist Church of Peoria, Illinois. Greetings were brought by the Rev. Randall S. Hilton, Regional Director of the American Unitarian Association and Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference. The Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor of the State of Illinois, and a member of the church, and Dr. George D. Stoddard, President of the University of Illinois and Moderator of the American Unitarian Association, addressed the congregation. The Rev. Kenneth C. Walker is the minister of the church.

BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA

The Unitarian Fellowship of Bloomington, Indiana, recently held meetings which were addressed by Rev. Ellsworth Smith of the First Unitarian Church, Cincinnati, Ohio, and Rev. Robert T. Weston of the First Unitarian Church of Louisville, Kentucky. Professor Ralph Fuchs is the President of the Fellowship.

BOWLING GREEN, OHIO

The Unitarian Fellowship of Bowling Green, Ohio, officially participated in Religious Emphasis Week at the Bowling Green State University. Mr. Warren H. Ransler is the President of the Fellowship.

BOULDER, COLORADO

The Unitarian Fellowship of Boulder, Colorado, has purchased a building and is renovating it for use in their religious education program.

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

Rev. R. Lester Mondale and the religious education committee of the Kansas City church recently invited Miss Mary Milner, religious education director of the St. Louis, Missouri, Unitarian Church, to visit the church and church school. She also addressed a parent-teacher dinner meeting.

RUPERT HOLLOWAY

Rev. Rupert Holloway recently resigned from the Wichita, Kansas, Unitarian Church to become the minister of the Unitarian church in Dunkirk, New York. Wichita was formerly in the Western Unitarian Conference but at the present time is a member of the Southwestern Conference. Other Western Conference churches served by Mr. Holloway were Bloomington, Illinois, and Madison, Wisconsin.

MRS. FRED DOEPPERS

Word has just been received of the recent death of Mrs. Fred Doeppers of Indianapolis. Her many friends throughout the Midwest, who knew her for her numerous contributions to the Lake Geneva Conference, for her sparkling personality and genuine friendliness, will truly miss her.

MERRILL BUSH

Dr. Merrill Bush of the Division of Education of the American Unitarian Association has recently made a field trip through the Western Unitarian Conference, visiting the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis; Davenport, Sioux City, Des Moines, and Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Omaha and Lincoln, Nebraska; Rockford and Bloomington, Illinois; and Indianapolis, Indiana.

GIVE TO THE
UNITED UNITARIAN APPEAL